

NORTH LITTLE ROCK BUILDING AND HOUSING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES

June 9, 2009

.....

The meeting of the North Little Rock Building and Housing Board of Adjustment was called to order by Vice-Chairwoman Zap at 9:32 A.M. in the Community Planning Office conference room.

Members Present:

**Tommy Cupples
Brad Hughes
Basil Shoptaw
Karen Zap**

Members Absent:

Phillip Davis

Staff Present:

**Wade Dunlap, City Planner
B. J. Jones, Secretary**

Others Present:

**Tim Wade, Action Sign & Neon
Russ Elrod, NLR Code Enforcement**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Mr. Cupples seconded the motion and there was no dissent.

Ms. Zap formed a motion to excuse Mr. Davis' absence from the meeting.

Mr. Shoptaw seconded the motion and there was no dissent.

OLD BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

1. **BHBA Case # 527** – Tim Wade, Action Sign and Neon, representing AT&T at 12005 Maumelle Blvd – To allow wall mounted signs on two sides of the building not facing street frontage.

Chairwoman Zap asked the applicant to state his name for the record and to state a hardship.

Mr. Wade explained that he is representing AT&T asking for permission to place additional signage on the building because of visibility issues. He explained that signage facing the parking lot cannot be seen from Maumelle and that signage facing Maumelle Blvd would eventually be obscured by the growth of the conservation wetlands between the store and Maumelle Blvd.

Mr. Dunlap confirmed that signage at the location indicated that the wetlands are protected.

Mr. Cupples asked what business is located in the center section of the building.

Mr. Dunlap replied that no business has located in the center, only Tropical Smoothie on the opposite end of the building.

Mr. Wade indicated that AT&T would occupy two spaces in the building.

Mr. Shoptaw asked if the location was a corner lot, already allowing two signs.

Mr. Dunlap replied that the location is not a corner lot, explaining that what appears to be a street is not a designated street, only an easement.

Mr. Hughes asked what had been allowed for Burger King.

Mr. Dunlap referred to the minutes from the meeting with Burger King representatives in attendance and noted that Burger King had asked for signage on all four sides of their building, but added that Mr. Cupples had formed the motion allowing signs on two sides only. That motion had passed and staff recommends the same for this current case.

Mr. Cupples asked for the applicant's request to be restated.

Mr. Dunlap replied that the request is for signage on the rear of the building to face Maumelle.

Mr. Cupples asked if that would be obscured by the wetlands.

Mr. Wade confirmed that eventually the wetlands would obscure the sign.

Mr. Dunlap added that the request was also for signage on the front of the building. He added that the applicant is entitled to one sign facing the boulevard, but that signage could be exchanged for a sign on the front of the building.

Mr. Wade acknowledged that the request is for all three signs.

Mr. Cupples interjected that all three signs would be objectionable, considering that Burger King was only allowed two signs. He asked what size the proposed signage would be.

There was additional discussion regarding the size of proposed signs, examining the drawings presented by the applicant.

Mr. Shoptaw asked the applicant if he might consider amending his application.

Mr. Wade acknowledged that there is really not adequate space for signage on the back of the building.

Mr. Dunlap agreed and added that was the reasoning for his recommendation.

Mr. Wade amended his application to request signage for the front of the building with an additional sign facing Maumelle.

Mr. Shoptaw formed a motion to grant the amended request which is in agreement with staff recommendations, allowing signage on the front side and on the side facing Maumelle Blvd.

Mr. Cupples seconded the motion and it passed with three affirmative votes. The one vote against the motion came from Mr. Hughes.

Mr. Wade questioned specific restrictions.

Mr. Dunlap confirmed that there are no specific restrictions. The sign can be placed anywhere on that side. He reminded Mr. Wade that he had ninety days to get his permit.

ADMINISTRATIVE:

Ms. Zap noted that she was not aware of any administrative business.

Mr. Dunlap asked Mr. Elrod to address the illegal banners at Tropical Smoothie.

Mr. Elrod confirmed he would investigate the matter.

PUBLIC COMMENT / ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Shoptaw made the motion to adjourn at 9:45am and there was no dissent.

PASSED: _____ RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

KAREN ZAP, VICE-CHAIRWOMAN

ROBERT VOYLES, DIRECTOR